

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,015	09/11/2003	Walter Schreiber	CAO-0428	5914
23413 75	590 06/05/2006		EXAM	INER
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP			ALI, SHUMAYA B	
55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3743	
			DATE MAILED, 06/05/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/660,015	SCHREIBER, WALTER
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Shumaya B. Ali	3743
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state that the period for reply will, by state that the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS tute, cause the application to become ABAND	FION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. FONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/3	<u>3/06</u> .	
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ TI	his action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	·	
Disposition of Claims		
4)  Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-23 is/are withdra 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreity a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents.</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a limit of the priority.</li> </ul>	ents have been received. ents have been received in Appli riority documents have been rec eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ication No ceived in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>		ail Date nal Patent Application (PTO-152)

## Election/Restrictions

In response to election/restriction mailed on 12/13/2005 the Applicant has elected group I, claims 1-23 without traverse. Claims 24-29 are withdrawn. Currently claims 1-23 are pending.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-10, 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. US Patent No. 6,408,981 B1 in view of Non-patent literature to Baril, 2004, Cut Smart Engineering & Manufacturing, Inc.
- 3. As to claims 1, 18-21 Smith et al. disclose a monolithic earplug being compressible (see abstract), resilient material ("soft and flexible to provide a comfortable fit for the wearer", col.3 lines 25-26). Smith et al. disclose an alternative method of making the earplug, however teaches that the monolithic structure my be cut into discrete pieces using any of variety of conventional cutting devices including water jet (col.5 lines 60-63). As to claim 2, Smith et al. discloses earplug as stated above for claim 1; therefore, method step as cited in claim 2 would have been obvious steps in making earplug. Although Smith et al. do not provide detail steps of water jet

Application/Control Number: 10/660,015 Page 3

Art Unit: 3743

cutting method as claimed by the applicant, however those steps would be considered obvious to one of ordinary skills when manufacturing earplugs using water jet cutting methods, and such method steps are well known in the art. Baril teaches waterjet cutting is a processing tool that uses high pressure water, thereby reciting limitation of claims 1, 3, and 16 (activating the water iet assembly to emit a high pressure water stream) for cutting many soft and semi-rigid materials like paper, plastic, and foam (further suggesting process can be applied for making earplug, which are conventionally made from resilient foam material). Therefore, limitation of claims 4-6 would be considered obvious steps in utilizing waterjet cutting device. As to claim 7, Baril teaches high-pressure water (50,000-60,000 psi) passes though a jeweled orifice that ranges from 0.003 to 0.013 inches and the flow enters a mixing tube or nozzle that ranges in size from 0.015 inches through 0.05 inches in diameter. Baril further teaches the stream of water causes a vacuum which draws finely crushed garnet (the abrasive) and as the water enters the mixing tube it mixes with the garnet, exiting from the tube at incredible forces making contact with the material to be cut, thereby further reciting limitations of claims 7-10,17, and 21-23. Since Smith et al. disclose method of making earplug and Baril teaches using a water jet cutting method to manufacture earplugs as required by the applicant's claimed invention, then why wouldn't it be obvious to apply the teachings of Baril to the invention of Smith et al. as an alternative efficient cutting methods for manufacturing earplugs because Baril further teaches waterjet cutting provides extremely accurate cuts with a high degree of repatability over a wide range of materials and shapes.

Application/Control Number: 10/660,015 Page 4

Art Unit: 3743

4. Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. US Patent No. 6,408,981 B1 and Non-patent literature to Baril, 2004, Cut Smart Engineering & Manufacturing, Inc and in view of Williams US Patent No. 5,573,015

5. As to claims 11-15, Smith et al method of forming earplug as modified by Baril teaches limitations cited for claims 1-10, and 15-23 above except for limitations cited in claims 11-15. However, earplug with hole extending along a longitudinal axis of he earplug entirely though the earplug and an stem being inserted in the hole as cited in claims 11-15 are well known in the art. Williams teaches earplug in figures 1-8 with core 12 inherently situated inside a cannel or hole with stiffer material, i.e. semi-rigid in order that it can provide structural rigidity for the earplug (see col.3 liens 29-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify the earplug of Smith et al. in view of Williams for the purposes of providing rigidity to the earplug. Since Williams teaches structural limitation cited in claims 11-15, the method steps would have been obvious to yield the final outcome of the product/earplug.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shumaya B. Ali whose telephone number is 571-272-6088. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry Bennett can be reached on 571-272-4791. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/660,015

Art Unit: 3743

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

xamilitr irt Uhit 3743 Page 5

Henry Sennett Supervisery Patent Examiner